

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13 are amended. Amended claims 1-4, 11 and 12 now incorporate the subject matter of claim 6 and contain no new matter. Support for the amended claims can be found, for example, in Fig. 3 and in paragraphs [0030] and [0031] of Applicants' specification.

I. Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Duong and Tran at the interview held July 19, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

II. Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 13 for a formality. As claim 13 has been amended to recite "pixel pitch" in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 2 and 4-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite. In accordance with the agreement reached during the July 19, 2007 interview, claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 12 have been amended to delete the words "a combination being determined such that." Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert the claim language is now definite and request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was objected to for having insufficient antecedent basis. As claim 6 is canceled, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0076046A1 to Komiya et al. (hereinafter "Komiya") and rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,135 to Nara. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As one or more of the features of claim 6 (which was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102) have been incorporated into claims 1, 2-4, 11, and 12, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2-4, 11 and 12 is respectfully requested. Further, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 7-10, 13 and 14, which variously depend from claims 1, 2-4, 11 and 12, is respectfully requested at least based on their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Komiya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,825,820 B2 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter "Yamazaki"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Yamazaki discloses using electric power lines of different widths to supply different driving voltages in Fig. 1B and at page 6, lines 5-15. This claimed feature has now been incorporated into claim 1. Thus, this rejection will be addressed in the context of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a sum of the widths of a plurality of lines including at least one electric power line formed in one line forming region is approximately the same as that of a sum of the widths of a plurality of lines formed in another line forming region." Claim 1 also recites, in part, "a plurality of electric power lines with different widths." While not addressed in the Office Action, during the July 19, 2007 interview, the Examiner asserted that Komiya discloses, at paragraph [0067], that the wiring of the power source lines 183, the

bypass lines 181 and the drain signal lines 152 could potentially all have the same width. Thus, according to the Examiner, when these lines have the same width, a sum of widths of a plurality of lines formed in one line forming region is approximately the same as that of a sum of widths of a plurality of lines formed in another line forming region.

However, this interpretation of Komiya would be inconsistent if applied to the Office Action's interpretation of Yamazaki. Specifically, according to the Office Action, Yamazaki discloses using power lines of different widths. Thus, if the widths of the power source, bypass and drain signal lines must be identical in Komiya to teach the claimed "sum of widths," Yamazaki cannot properly be combined with Komiya, as Yamazaki is relied upon to allegedly teach using power lines of different widths. To do so would change Komiya's principle of operation as applied to the rejected claims. Nomura fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yamazaki and Komiya. Therefore, the prior art does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1 as amended, and claims 7-8 depending therefrom.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1 and 7-8 be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MKW/jfb

Date: August 16, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
